

all of the States. Here is a State near the top of the alphabet that says to a violent criminal, every year you serve in prison you get 540 days off for good time. In other words, for every year you serve, you get out almost 2 years early. Serve 10 years—people say it is a big deal that we now say to violent criminals you have to serve 85 percent of their sentences. They get sentenced 10 years, they serve 85 percent of that time, and a violent criminal is out early. The average violent offender is now sentenced to a 20-year term and serves less than half of that sentence. The average person serving time in prison for murder in America serves only 7 years.

The States say, "If you are good in prison, we will let you out early." Then, people like Bettina and Jonathan and others get murdered because we decided we cannot afford to keep violent people in prison where they belong—180 days a year, good time credits for every year you serve, half a year off. Here is 180 days, 120 days, 365 days, 400 days, 547 days. These are the number of days of good time that the States give to these people. "If you are good in prison, no matter how violent you are, we let you out early." This has to stop. This sort of thing cannot continue in our country.

If we, as a country cannot assure the safety of innocent people by deciding that those who commit violent acts, those who commit murder, will go to prison and stay there until the end of their sentence, if we cannot assure people we will keep these folks off the street, then we, in my judgment, have not done our job. Most of this has to do with State government. In fact, all of this does.

Nobody is let out of the Federal system early. There is no automatic good time credit for being good in the Federal system. The last crime bill eliminated that because of my provision that said that we are going to get rid of good time. I want the States to do the same thing. If you are a violent criminal, no good time for good behavior. You are going to be sent to prison to be kept off the streets.

I am introducing legislation next week called the SAFER Act, the Stop Allowing Felons Early Release Act. I want to distinguish between the felons in prison who are violent versus those who are not. I want prisoners who committed violent crimes to know that when they go in prison, they are going to stay in prison until the end of their term. My bill provides an incentive through the Federal truth in sentencing grant program to eliminate parole and good time credits for violent offenders.

We have an amount of money under the truth in sentencing grant program for prison construction, and for other purposes, that is allocated to eligible States. I would reduce these grants by 25 percent for the States that have not decided to end early release for violent criminals. For those States who have

decided they will end early release for violent criminals, they will participate fully in this grant program and receive an incentive payment.

If a State decides it does not want to do that, that it wants to keep moving violent prisoners back to the streets, then they will lose a portion of this incentive grant program.

My legislation is simple. It will not force the States to do anything, but it will say to them, with the amount of money that we are using here in the Congress, in the crime bill, we want to at least try to provide incentive to those States that do the right thing. The right thing is to start deciding all across this country, especially in the State criminal justice systems, that violent people sent to prison will stay in prison.

It is probably hard to know how some of these families feel, especially when they discover their loved one has been killed by somebody who should not have been in a position to kill anybody. My mother was killed in a manslaughter incident. It was not the kind of incident I have described with Jonathan Hall and Bettina Pruckmayr, but I understand getting a telephone call about having a loved one involved in this kind of a crime, having a loved one lose her life in a violent crime. I can only imagine how families feel when they hear that their daughter or their mother or their son has been killed, and then they discover that the perpetrator was someone who has murdered two other people and spent a fraction of the time they should have spent in jail, but who, because the State let them out early, was in their neighborhood threatening their lives and their children's lives.

This country has to do better than that. This country has to decide there are some criminals who, by their acts of violence, demonstrate that they deserve no good time, no early release. The American people deserve to have those people sentenced and put away in a prison cell until the end of their term.

I hope very much that, as we discuss a crime bill this year and continue to work through the questions that confront the American people about jobs and crime and health care and education, and the range of issues that people care about and want us to do something about, we will take a look at this issue. Do we not have an obligation, when we have a person who has committed a murder, a kidnapping, another murder, to decide that this person does not deserve to be on our streets? Do we not have that responsibility? If the State governments do not exercise that responsibility, do we not have the right to try to provide some incentive and initiative there? I think we do.

This issue of devolution that we are talking about now in the Congress is that the Federal Government cannot do anything right, so we should send it all back to the State and local govern-

ments. These cases I am talking about are all State cases. Nobody is getting out of the Federal prisons early to do this. We have determinate sentencing, and there is no good time because I saw to it.

In the State judicial systems, you can earn up to 2 years off of your sentence for every year served. All you have to do is be good. Half of our prison population in America are nonviolent prisoners. Half of them are convicted of violent crimes. I want us as a country to distinguish between the two. I want prison cells open and available for those who have committed violent acts. Jonathan Hall should not be dead today, nor should Bettina Pruckmayr, nor should 3,400 other Americans killed by people let out early, who should have still been in prison. I hope we will discuss this at some great length this year as we discuss the crime bill.

With that, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUGAR). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate as in morning business for 8 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Iowa.

DRUG POLICY, DRUG TRENDS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, recent information from a wide variety of sources make two things very clear about the issue of drug policy, drug trends and the problems it causes, and that is that teenage drug use is on the rise, a disturbingly fast rise, and also that the American public remains very concerned about the need for counter-drug policies that are effective.

We know from virtually every survey, every reporting mechanism on drug use that adolescent use is on a rocket ride into the upper atmosphere. We know from hospital data that emergency room admissions are on the increase and that many of these involve young people. Late last year, we had firm confirmation of just how bad things are and where they are headed.

The administration released the latest high school survey. These data make it abundantly clear that not only is use of drugs going up, but youthful attitude toward the dangers of drug use are changing and changing for the worst. The best spin that the administration could put on the data was somehow, "Well, it's not as bad as it was in 1979."

Just what sort of a comment does that say? It notes that since 1992, the proportion of 10th graders using illicit

drugs in the prior 12 months had risen by almost 75 percent. Marijuana use among 8th graders—those would be people as young as 13 years of age—has risen by 2½ times. Prevalence among 10th graders has doubled.

These figures are bad enough, but what is worse is that they come after decades of decline. If we had a chart, that chart would show from these very same surveys, because they have been annual over a long period of time, that from 1979 down through 1992, there was a dramatic drop in the number of teenagers experimenting with drugs.

Since 1992, as this recent report clearly states, something is wrong, and there is a dramatic rise in that downward trend of the years from 1979 to 1992.

But that is not all, Mr. President. The DAWN survey of emergency room admissions is up. The PRIDE survey, echoing the problems in our schools, shows that use is up. The household survey shows that use is up. So, clearly, something is wrong. But we can take heart: Things are not as bad as they were in 1979.

What these figures mean is that we are storing up trouble for the next decade. We are in the process today of creating a new wave of drug abuse and addiction that is going to create problems for tomorrow.

This trend, as I said, comes after years of decline in adolescent use and the creation of an understanding during that period of time among the young about the dangers of drug use that helped to insulate them from ever starting to experiment with drugs.

Over the last 4 years, with this trend going up, that attitude that drugs are dangerous among young people is changing. So I think it is legitimate to ask and look at reasons why it is changing.

One of the principal reasons is that we have lost a coherent public message that drug use is dangerous and wrong. One of the main reasons for this is the disappearing act performed by the President on the whole drug question. Simply put, the bully pulpit stands empty. There is no message and no moral authority.

That, hopefully, is changing with the appointment of the new drug czar. Hopefully that is changing with the President 10 days ago in Baltimore holding a nationwide meeting by satellite to young people on the dangers of drugs and the President's concern about it.

The President in his speech mentioned the problems that his family had with drugs, I guess a brother it was.

Hopefully, it is turning around just because the President feels comfortable talking about the problem. It seemed to me that for this whole first term of office, the President must not have talked about it because he did not feel comfortable talking about it.

But whether it is the President of the United States, whether it is the music

stars that the younger generation looks to that are parading the legitimacy of drug use or movie stars, the movie industry not playing it down, or whether it is just a plain lack that we do not have on television anymore the ads that the industry used to put on that drug use was bad, the public service announcements that drug use was bad, whatever it is, it all adds up to this dramatic increase in the use of drugs, most important, the dangerous experimentation by young people and the fact that that portends danger 10 years down the road for other problems that come from enhancement of drug use, the crime and everything that goes with it.

So there is no message out there, and the people who used to have the moral authority to give that message are no longer giving it.

Daily, more Americans die from the consequences of drug use, more are maimed in drug-related violence than have died in many of our overseas ventures. Certainly, more lives are at risk than have been lost to date in Bosnia. Yet, what do we see? We see a commitment of manpower, resources and treasure bound for far-flung fields in dubious enterprises of peacekeeping, and meanwhile we have a major problem right here at home calling for action and leadership.

We send peacekeeping missions to Bosnia, but where is our antidrug mission in Detroit? Where are the prime time news events to sell a policy on drugs, that drugs are dangerous? As I have said, the President had this wonderful assembly in Baltimore to bring attention to it. He has appointed an outstanding person as drug czar. But until these things happen—where was the media attention from past action by our political leadership on the drug problem?

If you do not think there is a problem of leadership on the drug question, try to find a word in the newspapers at that time about the resignation of Dr. Brown when he resigned late last year. Try to find mention of recent Gallup polls on public opinion about drugs. Try to find honorable mention of the surveys, the other surveys that I mentioned in my comments this afternoon.

If you go back to this period of time when the political leadership of America during the 1980's was saying, "Just say no to drugs," when our TV tubes were filled with stories and public service announcements about the dangers of drugs, when our respected leaders in entertainment were saying drugs are bad—Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 5 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. When we had Bill Bennett resign as drug czar during this period of time, it was front-page news. When Dr. Brown left 2 or 3 months ago, you may remember the story was buried someplace on page 12 in one of the newspapers I read. Dr. Brown's resignation there, the story of it was buried

along with news about drugs or the public's concern.

That fact of how the media treat this very serious problem, versus how serious the public at the grassroots really feel it is, tells us something about the present state of our drug policy and how the media think. Since they do not care about the drug issue, since the media do not care about the drug issue, it ceases to be news. Never mind the public attitude or what these surveys show, just somehow it does not happen to be news.

It is clear, however, Mr. President, that the public is very, very concerned about this issue. A poll earlier this year showed that over 80 percent of the public saw stopping the flow of illegal drugs to the United States as their primary foreign policy concern. Just in the last few weeks, the Gallup poll organization released information on the public's attitude about drugs.

This poll makes it clear that, unlike with the administration or the press, the drug issue has not fallen off the public's agenda. According to this poll by Gallup, 94 percent—I want to repeat that—94 percent of the American public say the drug abuse problem is either a crisis or a serious problem. They rate drugs second only to crime, which often is linked to drugs as their main concern.

Indeed, according to the poll, Americans rate the drug problem as more serious than the problems of health care, welfare reform, or even the budget deficit. Since you would be hard pressed to find this concern reflected in our media, press, radio, and TV, I think we ought to state that again. The public rates the drug problem as more serious than health care, welfare, and the deficit. So I hope our national media leaders are going to take that to heart. Of course, I hope our policy leaders pay attention.

Congress is listening, probably because we are closer to the grassroots. We have a responsibility in the process of representative government to keep our ear to the grassroots. I think most do. And following up on that, Senator DOLE and Speaker GINGRICH declared a new initiative on drugs. This is in keeping with the past congressional efforts to make the drug issue a very serious policy concern. We created the drug czar's office to coordinate policy in the middle of the last decade. We gave the administration a variety of tools to improve our international efforts.

We have supported coherent programs when they have been explained and defended. Just this week, we gave \$3.9 million, in this appropriations bill that we are on, to the Office of Drug Policy so our drug czar can have more equipment to do his work. We have acted in the past to encourage direction and purpose, and it is clear that we need to do this more often. So that is why the task force launched by our majority leader and the Speaker of the House will help us to do that. I happened to be named cochair of that task

force. I also have the position of Chairman of the Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control.

In both of these efforts, every member of the task force and the caucus—we pledge to do everything we can to put this issue back on the right track, meaning that it is as important a policy concern for us in the Congress as it is for the 94 percent of the people at the grassroots who say it is a major concern, more so than balancing the budget or welfare reform or health care reform. I believe my colleagues will do that.

But there is no task force, there is no caucus, no law that we can pass that is the answer to this problem by itself or even a serious commitment by the administration to this—albeit that is very, very important as an answer. Hopefully, the new appointee as czar highlights that, and he will do that. I feel that he will. We also, though, need a more sweeping, renewed effort to get the word out to a new generation of young people about the harm and wrongs of using drugs.

But our efforts cannot stop or start with just Government action. It is going to take a public commitment to the effort. We have to see communities and families reengaged on the issue. We need parents talking to children. We need a strong, clear message coming from our cultural elite, from the media, and from our community leaders. It is a message that we must continually renew. It is not a sometime thing, Mr. President.

If we do not do this on a concerted basis, we put the next generation at risk. Most importantly, as political leaders, as just part of the element of our total society to accomplish this goal, we have ignored our responsibilities, but so have the other elements of society.

When mothers sell their sons for drugs, when our own military bases are not free of drug trafficking, we have a problem that touches home. While only one American has died in Bosnia, many Americans die from drug use and have their lives ruined by drugs every day. We have a clear interest in doing something meaningful on this issue. It strikes home. The public understands it. The American people support meaningful action. This is a problem that we cannot afford to ignore. It is an issue that can only grow worse if we do not act. That is why the initiative to establish a serious drug policy is critical for the future.

So, I call not just upon my colleagues to work to renew our effort or to renew Congress' leadership on an issue so essential to the health and welfare of the Nation's young, but I call upon all of society to respond accordingly.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAFEE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

BALANCED BUDGET DOWNPAYMENT ACT, II

The Senate continued with consideration of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 3547 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3466

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], for himself, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. PELL, Mr. DASCHLE and Mr. KERRY, proposes an amendment numbered 3547 to No. 3466.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

The appropriation for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency in Public Law 103-317 (108 STAT. 1768) is amended by deleting after "until expended" the following: "only for activities related to the implementation of the Chemical Weapons Convention": *Provided*, That amounts made available shall not be used to undertake new programs or to increase employment above levels on board at the time of enactment of this Act.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, we have been working with the other side of the aisle to see if there was some way to get additional operating resources for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency or "ACDA" as it is called. ACDA's appropriation in this bill has been reduced to \$35,700,000, down from its current level of \$50,378,000, and far below the President's request of \$75,300,000.

This amendment frees up approximately \$2,700,000 in prior year appropriations that are earmarked in the fiscal year 1995 Commerce, Justice, and State Appropriations Act for the Chemical Weapons Convention. It allows these resources to be used instead for ACDA salaries and expenses. The amendment stipulates that these funds not be used to increase ACDA's staff. However, given the current funding situation that I have outlined, adding staff does not appear to be a viable option for this agency.

Mr. President, we have tried to find an acceptable offset or list of offsets to provide ACDA with more than the \$2,700,000 in this amendment. I know that was the wish of our distinguished minority leader, Senator DASCHLE, and Senator PELL, our former Foreign Relations Committee chairman. I believe that was the hope of the chairman of our committee, Senator HATFIELD. However, this has not proven to be possible and this amendment represents the best we can do at this time.

I urge adoption of the amendment.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, this amendment has been cleared on both sides of the aisle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 3547) was agreed to.

Mr. HATFIELD. I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay it on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION REFINANCING

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I would like to speak briefly on section 3303 of the bill we are now considering. Section 3303, on Bonneville Power Administration refinancing, is bipartisan legislation which would resolve permanently past interest rate subsidy criticisms regarding the Federal Columbia River Power System [FCRPS] investments in a manner that benefits Federal taxpayers while minimizing the impact of the Bonneville Power Administration's [Bonneville] power and transmission rates.

Section 3303 is substantially equivalent to legislation transmitted to the Congress by the administration on September 15, 1994. Senator MURRAY and I introduced the administration's proposal as S. 92 on January 4, 1995. The Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources reported S. 92 on July 11, 1995. This legislation has already passed the Senate and the House as part of H.R. 2491, the 7-Year Balanced Budget Reconciliation Act of 1995. The administration continues to support this legislation and I urge the Senate to adopt it again.

This legislation is important to my region of the country because it will enhance the long-term electric rate stability of the Bonneville Power Administration and thereby better position Bonneville to retain market share and thereby be better able to fund all of its responsibilities, including the fish and wildlife duties under the Northwest Power Act and the repayment obligations to the U.S. Treasury. In exchange for providing enhanced certainty to Bonneville in terms of its Treasury repayment responsibilities, the U.S. Treasury would realize additional returns from Bonneville ratepayers and the Federal budget deficit would be reduced by about \$89 million over the current 7-year budget window. In short, section 3303 would provide long-term rate stability benefits for Northwest ratepayers and increased revenues for the U.S. Treasury. The Congress should again pass this legislation and forward it to the President for final enactment.

Mr. President, Bonneville is at a crossroads. As a power marketer of abundant inexpensive hydroelectric power from the Columbia River and other river systems in the Pacific Northwest, Bonneville was for many years unhampered by serious competitive pressure. Free for the most part